UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,804	09/28/2001	Lauge S. Sorensen	2207/12794	2876

23838   .7590   03/24/2004

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
MOAZZAMI, NASSER G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2187	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _20 February 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
    closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _2-8,10-16 and 18-28_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _2-8, 10-16, and 18-28_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
    application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This office action is in response to applicant's amendment dated 02/20/2004 in response to office action mailed on 10/14/2003.

2.   Claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-28 have been presented in this application for examination. No claims has been canceled or added. Therefore, claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-28 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 02/20/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant claim language is reciting "a method of responding to a URL request comprising: receiving the URL request from a client computer; determining a cache in a cache array that stores a URL corresponding to the URL request; and redirecting the URL request to the determined cache; wherein said determining and redirecting is executed by a network processor that is transparent to said client computer".

Applicant's arguments that "operate independently and outside of the cache array, and not function as a proxy server itself" (page 7, lines 17-19 of the applicant's response), "would not require any knowledge of the network processor" (page 8, lines 4-5 of the applicant's response), "operate independently of the client browser's knowledge and requires no reprogramming of the client browser" (page 8, lines 11-12 of the applicant's response), and "do not require controlling the caches of the network processor" (page 8, lines 20-21 of the applicant's response) is not supported by the claim language.

Wu clearly discloses receiving the URL request from a client computer *[request for the web object from client]*; determining a cache in a cache array that stores a URL corresponding to the URL request *[finding a partition corresponding to the URL]*; and redirecting the URL request to the determined cache *[request will be forwarded to the cache server associated with the assigned partition]*, but fails to teach a network processor that is transparent to the client computer and perform the determining and redirecting steps. However, Cohen discloses a computer network and a method for transparently intercepting client's request and redirecting the request to appropriate cache in order to maintain control over which one of the proxy cache the request is directed to and to reduce and minimize network's traffic *[ISP transparently intercept a client's web request and send it to one of its proxy caches; proxy redirector selects one of the caches to forward the client request]*.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the current invention to employ proxy redirector as being taught by Cohen

into Wu's caching apparatus in order to reduce and minimize network's traffic by having

control over sending the request to an appropriate cache in the cache array. Therefore,

the rejection of the claims is proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Wu et al., hereinafter Wu (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,620) in view of

Cohen et al., hereinafter Cohen (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,462).

As for claims 6-8, 14-16, 18, 21-22, and 27-28, Wu discloses a method of

responding to a URL request: receiving the URL request from a client computer

[request for the web object from client (column 1, line 56)]; determining a cache in a

cache array that stores a URL corresponding to the URL request *[to find a partition*

corresponding to the URL (column 1, lines 52-53)]; and redirecting the URL request

to the determined cache *[request will be forwarded to the cache server associated*

with the assigned partition (column 1, lines 56-58)].

Wu discloses the claimed invention, but fails to specifically teach a network processor that is transparent to the client computer and perform the determining and redirecting steps.

Cohen discloses a computer network and a method for transparently intercepting client's request and redirecting the request to appropriate cache in order to maintain control over which one of the proxy cache the request is directed to and to reduce and minimize network's traffic *[ISP transparently intercept a client's web request and send it to one of its proxy caches (column 1, lines 24-48); proxy redirector selects one of the caches to forward the client request (column 7, lines 43-45)]*.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the current invention to employ proxy redirector as being taught by Cohen into Wu's caching apparatus in order to reduce and minimize network's traffic by having control over sending the request to an appropriate cache in the cache array.

As for claims 2, 10, 19, and 23, Wu discloses that the cache array comprises a plurality of caches and provides for redirection among the plurality of caches *[collections of shared caches (column 1, lines 31-32); redirecting the request to another web cache server (column 6, lines 8-10)]*.

As for claims 3-5, 11-13, 20, and 24-26, Wu discloses that the cache array is a cache array routing protocol based array *[cache array routing protocol (column 1, line 40)]*.

Conclusion

6.   THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Nasser G Moazzami whose telephone number is (703)

305-0017. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Donald Sparks can be reached on (703) 308-1756. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

8.   Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 746-

7240.

NASSER MOAZZAMI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

03/23/2004